



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/616,883	07/14/2000	Takeshi Kato	325772018400	6584

25227 7590 05/13/2005  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD  
SUITE 300  
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

PHAM, THIERRY L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2624

DATE MAILED: 05/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/616,883

Applicant(s)

KATO, TAKESHI

Examiner

Thierry L. Pham

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

- This action is responsive to the following communication: an Amendment filed on 2/15/05.
- Claims 1-55 are pending in application.
- Responsive to claim objections (claims 3-4, 16-17) in previous office action has been acknowledged and objections have been withdrawn.

#### *Claim Objections*

Claim 33 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 33 cannot dependent on itself. Appropriate correction is required.

#### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments, see pages 15-16, filed on 2/15/05, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-22, 25-34, 36-45, and 47-55 under 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of newly found prior art reference (US 5740405) due to newly added limitations/features "a deciding controller for determining adaptability between *an old version of the first software program that has already been installed and a new version of the second software program, or for determining adaptability between an old version of the second software program that has already been installed and a new version of the first software program, where the first software program is of a type different than the second software program*".

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-22, 25-34, 36-45, 47-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohara et al (U.S. 6438643), and in view of DeGraaf (US 5740405).

Regarding claim 1, Ohara discloses a management device (manager device, fig. 1, col. 16, lines 13-37) for managing a print system comprising a data processor (NIC 1 includes a CPU, fig. 1, col. 14, lines 14-63) connected to a network (fig. 1, col. 13, lines 58-67) and a printer for executing a print job sent from the data processor via the network, the data processor having a first software program which are installed therein (NIC 1 firmware store in ROM 6, fig. 1, col. 16, lines 13-65), and the printer having a second software program which are installed therein (printer firmware store in ROM 12, fig. 1, col. 15, lines 49-59), the device comprising: (2) updating controller (CPU 50 of manager G initiates an upgrading routines, figs. 2-5, col. 15, lines 60-67) for executing a predetermined process to update the first (NIC firmware update, fig. 8, col. 17, lines 21-67) and the second software programs (printer firmware update, fig. 8, col. 17, lines 21-67) on the data processor and the printer based on the determination result by the determining controller.

However, Ohara explicitly teaches a method/device for updating printer's software and to determine its adaptabilities but fails to teach a deciding controller for determining adaptability between an old version of the first software program that has already been installed and a new version of the second software program or for determining adaptability between an old version of the second software program that has already been installed and a new version of the first software program, where the first software program is of a type different than the second software program.

DeGraaf, in the same field of endeavor for updating software/programs, teaches a deciding controller (CPU, fig. 9) for determining adaptability between an old version of the first software program that has already been installed and a new version of the second software program (determines adaptability/compatibility between versions of application and/or different types of applications programs, col. 7, lines 44-46 and col. 8, lines 41-50), or for determining adaptability between an old version of the second software program that has already been

Art Unit: 2624

installed and a new version of the first software program, where the first software program is of a type different than the second software program (col. 8, lines 41-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Ohara's system to include a method/device for determining adaptability/compatibility of different programs as per teachings of DeGraaf because of a following reason: installing the latest/newest compatible printer driver will improve operating efficiency of the printer; (2) to reduce cost of manufacturing/operating (Ohara, col. 24, lines 8-35). Please also notes: Obviously, Ohara's NIC firmware and printer firmware must be compatible (i.e. fig. 8 shows NIC firmware version and printer firmware version); otherwise, printer cannot be able to communicate with other devices such as server G.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ohara with DeGraaf to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Regarding claim 2, Ohara further discloses the management device according to claim 1, wherein the updating controller updates the first software program and the second software program in a predetermined order which is defined based on the determination result by the determining controller (update NIC and printer firmware, figs. 8-14, col. 17, lines 1-67 to col. 19, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 3, Ohara further discloses the management device according to claim 2, wherein when the determining controller determines that there is no adaptability between the new version of the first software program and the old version of the second software program, the updating controller updates first the second software program and then updates the first software program (figs. 8-14 shows firmware can be update in any order, i.e., printer than NIC or NIC then printer, col. 17, lines 1-67 to col. 19, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 4, Ohara further discloses the management device according to claim 2, wherein when the determining controller determines that there is no adaptability between the new version of the second software program and the old version of the first software program, the updating controller updates first the first software program and then updates the second

Art Unit: 2624

software program (figs. 8-14 shows firmware can be update in any order, i.e., printer than NIC or NIC then printer, col. 17, lines 1-67 to col. 19, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 5, Ohara further discloses the management device according to claim 1, wherein the updating controller controls execution and prohibition (fig. 14, col. 21, lines 23-67) of update of the first and the second software programs based on the determination result by the determining controller.

Regarding claim 6, Ohara further discloses the management device according to claim 5, wherein when the determining controller determines that the new version of the first software program is not adaptable to neither of the new version of the second software program and the old version of the second software program, the updating controller prohibits the first software program already installed from being updated (prohibiting updates if software/firmware are incompatible with devices, fig. 10 & 14, col. 21, lines 23-67 and col. 23, lines 1-62).

Regarding claim 7, Ohara further discloses the management device according to claim 5, wherein when the determining controller determines that the new version of the second software program is not adaptable to neither the new version or the old version of the first software program, the updating controller prohibits the second software program already installed from being updated (prohibiting updates if software/firmware are incompatible with devices via CRT, fig. 10 & 14, col. 21, lines 23-67 and col. 23, lines 1-62).

Regarding claim 8, Ohara further discloses 8, the management device according to claim 1, wherein the updating controller sends a message which prompts update of the first and the second software programs to the data processor to display the message (Figs. 11-14, col. 21, lines 1-67), based on the determination result by the determining controller.

Regarding claim 9, Ohara further discloses the management device according to claim 1, further comprising a memory (ROM and RAM of Manager device, fig. 1, col. 17, lines 1-67 to col. 20, lines 1-67) for storing information about the adaptability between new version and old

Art Unit: 2624

version for the first software program and the second software program, wherein the determining controller downloads the information about the adaptability via the network (LAN network, fig. 1, col. 13, lines 33-67) into the memory to determine the adaptability based on the downloaded (downloads files and adaptabilities from server, col. 19, lines 33-52) information.

Regarding claim 10, Ohara further discloses the management device according to claim 1, wherein the management device is incorporated in the printer (fig. 1 shows a printer having a CPU for processing updates and ROM for storing update software and its compatibilities, col. 16, lines 12-65).

Regarding claim 11, Ohara further discloses the management device according to claim 10, wherein the updating controller receives information about the version of the first software (figs. 8-12) program installed in the data processor, as well as the print job (col. 15, lines 14-25) sent from the data processor, and executes said predetermined process based on the received information about the version.

Regarding claim 12, Ohara further discloses the management device according to claim 1, wherein when the other data processor (NICs and computers, fig. 1, col. 13, lines 33-67) is connected to the network, the updating controller also executes the predetermined process to the other data processor.

Regarding claim 13, Ohara further discloses the management device according to claim 1, wherein the first software program (ROM 6 of NIC for storing processing software/firmware, col. 14, lines 43-50 and col. 15, lines 49-58) controls the data processor to generate a print job corresponding to the printer, and the second software program controls (ROM 12 of printer for storing processing software/firmware, col. 15, lines 49-58) the printer to execute the print job generated by the first software program.

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claims 14-22, recite limitations that are similar to those as described in claims 1-8 above; therefore, same rejection rationale/basis as described in claims 1-8 also applied to claims 14-22.

Regarding claims 25-30: Claims 25-30 are the methods corresponding to the apparatus 1-2, 5, 8-9, 13 (respectively). The methods are included by the operation of the apparatus as described in claims 1-2, 5, 8-9, and 13. Please see claims rejection basis/rationale as described in claims 1-2, 5, 8-9, 13 above.

Regarding claims 31-34: Claims 31-34 are the method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims 1-2, 5, 8 (respectively). The methods are included by the operation of the apparatus as described in claims 1-2, 5, 8. Please see claims rejection basis/rationale as described in claims 1-2, 5, 8 above.

Claims 36-41 correspond to method claims 25-30 except computer readable memory medium for storing program is claimed rather than printing system or data output apparatus and/or method. All computers/printers have some type of computer readable memory medium (RAM or ROM, Fig. 1) for storing computer programs, hence claims 36-41 would be rejected using the same rationale as in claims 25-30.

Claims 42-45 correspond to method claims 31-34 except computer readable memory medium for storing program is claimed rather than printing system or data output apparatus and/or method. All computers/printers have some type of computer readable memory medium (RAM or ROM, Fig. 1) for storing computer programs, hence claims 42-45 would be rejected using the same rationale as in claims 31-34.

Regarding claims 47-49, recite limitations that are similar to those as described in claims 1, 3, and 8 above; therefore, same rejection rationale/basis as described in claims 1, 3, and 8 also applied to claims 47-49.



Regarding claims 50-52: Claims 50-52 are the method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims 47-49 (respectively). The methods claims are included by the operation of the apparatus claims. Please see claims rejection basis/rationale as described in claims 47-49 above.

Claims 53-55 correspond to method claims 50-52 except computer readable memory medium for storing program is claimed rather than printing system or data output apparatus and/or method. All computers/printers have some type of computer readable memory medium (RAM or ROM, Fig. 1) for storing computer programs, hence claims 53-55 would be rejected using the same rationale as in claims 50-52.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 23-24, 35, 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohara and DeGraaf as described in claims 1-22, 25-34, 36-45 above, and in view of Benjamin et al (U.S. 6113208).

Regarding claims 23-24, the combinations of Ohara and Fukada do not disclose wherein the management device comprising an activating controller for accessing periodically a WEB site on which the latest version of the first and the second software are registered, determining whether or not the first and the second software programs registered on the WEB site are updated, and activating the determining controller and the updating controller when the first and second software programs are determined to be updated.

Benjamin, in the same field of networking and printing, discloses the management device (host processor, fig. 3) comprising an activating controller (microprocessor, fig. 3) for accessing periodically a WEB site (downloading updated/new version of printer driver via Internet/Web site, col. 3, lines 50-67 to col. 4, lines 1-40) on which the latest version of the first and the second

Art Unit: 2624

software are registered, determining whether or not the first and the second software programs registered on the WEB site are updated, and activating the determining controller and the updating controller when the first and second software programs are determined to be updated.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Ohara as per teachings of Benjamin because of a following reason: (1) downloading and installing the latest/newest compatible printer driver will improve operating efficiency of the printer; (2) to reduce cost of manufacturing/operating (Ohara, col. 24, lines 8-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ohara and DeGraaf with Benjamin to obtain the invention as specified in claims 23-24.

Regarding claim 35: Claim 35 is a method claim corresponding to the apparatus claim 23. The method claims are inherent and included by the operation of the apparatus claims. Please see claims rejection basis/rationale as described in claim 23 above.

Claim 46 corresponds to method claim 35 except computer readable memory medium for storing program is claimed rather than printing system or data output apparatus and/or method. All computers/printers have some type of computer readable memory medium (RAM or ROM, Fig. 1 of Ohara) for storing computer programs, hence claim 46 would be rejected using the same rationale as in claim 35.

### *Conclusion*

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- US 5499357 to Sonty et al, teaches a method for determining adaptability/compatibility of different software/programs when installing new software/programs and/or upgrade/downgrade software/programs.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2624


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thierry L. Pham whose telephone number is (571) 2727439. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30 AM - 6:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571)272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thierry L. Pham

  
GABRIEL GARCIA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER